DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 756 FL 018 757

AUTHOR	Alamprese, Judy; And Others
TITLE	The ESL Teacher Institute: Its Impact and Future.
INSTITUTION	Association of California School Administrators, Sacramento. Foundation for Educational Administration.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jan 88
NOTE	117p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Beginning Teachers; Competency Based Education; *English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Language Teachers; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Staff Development; Teaching Methods; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*English as a Second Language Teacher Institute

ABSTRACT

The English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) Teacher Institute, created in 1980, is a staff development program for preparing instructors to use ESL techniques and materials. The Institute is for beginning and inexperienced ESL teachers. An evaluation of the 1986-87 institute was undertaken to determine the institute's impact on instructors' abilities to use ESL techniques, sequential steps, and competency-based adult education (CBAE) classroom management methods, and instructors' and trainers' perceptions about the acquisition of instructional skills through systematic training and reinforcement. Two types of data were collected including classsroom observations of the use of CBAE methods by participants, and survey responses concerning the institute's design and content. Analysis of the results indicates that the institute has met its objectives of increasing participants' abilities to use the techniques, sequential steps, and CBAE strategies, and that the coaching process implemented during the year was useful to teachers. In addition, instructors found that the institute was well-designed and well-paced, but felt the quantity of techniques taught could be reduced and the material treated in greater depth. Trainers felt the opportunities for skill refinement and enhancement were valuable. Several areas for improvement of the institute were identified. Appendixes contain the various feedback and evaluation forms used in the study. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323756

DISSEMINATION NETWORK for ADULT EDUCATORS

THE ESL TEACHER INSTITUTE: ITS IMPACT AND FUTURE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Judy Alamprese,
Cosmos Corporation

Autumn Keltner,
ADK Consultant Services

K. Lynn Savage,
ESL Teacher Institute

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Lynn Savage

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A dissemination project sponsored by the California State Department of Education and ACSA, Foundation for Educational Administration.

FL018757

© ACSA Foundation for Educational Administration, 1985

This work was developed by the Dissemination Network for Adult Educators, Association of California School Administrators, Foundation for Educational Administration under a state-administered contract of the Federal P.L.91-230, Section 310 from the California State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall Sacramento, California 95814. However,the content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that department or the United States Department of Education. No official endorsement of this work should be inferred.

January 1988

DISSEMINATION
NETWORK for
ADULT
EDUCATORS

THE ESL TEACHER INSTITUTE: ITS IMPACT AND FUTURE

Executive Summary

Judy Alamprese,
Cosmos Corporation

Autumn Keltner,
ADK Consultant Services

K. Lynn Savage,
ESL Teacher Institute

A dissemination project sponsored by the California State Department of Education and ACSA, Foundation for Educational Administration.

© ACSA, Foundation for Educational Administration, 1985

This work was developed by the Dissemination Network for Adult Educators, Association of California School Administrators, Foundation for Educational Administration under a state-administered contract of the Federal P.L. 91-230, Section 310 from the California State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814. However, the content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that department or the United States Department of Education. No official endorsement of this work should be inferred.

January 1988

Executive Summary

The ESL Teacher Institute

Created in 1980, the English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) Teacher Institute is a staff development program for preparing instructors to use ESL techniques and materials. The Institute has been designed for inexperienced instructors of ESL in adult basic education as well as for individuals who have not previously taught ESL or adults.

The Institute's development has occurred in three stages: 1) the provision of Core Workshops, 2) the incorporation of a competency-based adult education approach in the Workshops, and 3) the inclusion of classroom management and coaching strategies into an ESL Institute. During the first stage of the program, 1980-1982, training was provided through the ESL Core Workshops. The workshops, offered for 12 hours over a weekend, focused on the development of four language skills--listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Workshop participants were taught how to use specific ESL instructional techniques--e.g., dialogues and communicative drills--that were reflective of state-of-the-art practice in ESL.

Refinement of the Core Workshops continued during an intermediary stage of development, 1982-1985, during which time the training design and content were revised. The length of the

workshops shifted from 12 hours offered over two days to a one-day, eight-hour session. The major change was in the content of the workshops, which were refined to include a competency-based adult education approach.

The third stage of development began in 1985, with the creation of the current ESL Institute. During this period, the training design changed from an eight-hour session to three four-hour sessions, with up to one-month intervals between sessions. The content of the Institute was also expanded, such that the Institute currently focuses on the development of three types of skills: 1) ESL instructional techniques, 2) competency-based classroom management strategies, and 3) coaching techniques. In addition to refinements in design and content, the training process was revised to include the standardization of training materials and demonstration of instructional techniques. As well, on-going staff development has been provided for ESL Institute trainers through the provision of colloquia, which are opportunities for trainers to refine and renew their training skills.

Evaluation of the ESL Institute

As the development and refinement of the ESL Institute progressed, staff from the Institute and California State Department of Education were interested in assessing the effects of the Institute on improving instructors' skills in utilizing

ESL Techniques, and in enhancing their overall instructional abilities. There also was a desire to understand the Institute trainers' perceptions about their own skill development. Thus, an evaluation of the 1986-87 ESL Institute was undertaken, in order to determine the Institute's impact on:

* Instructors' abilities to use ESL Techniques;
* Instructors' abilities to use the sequential steps in Techniques (e.g., techniques for listening, speaking, and reading);
* Instructors' capacities to use Competency-Based Adult Education (CBAE) classroom management methods; and
* Instructors' and trainers perceptions about the acquisition of instructional skills through systematic training and reinforcement.

In order to assess the impact of the Institute on its participants and trainers, two types of data were collected during 1986-87. The first focused on participants' abilities to conduct an appropriate CBAE lesson, utilizing the ESL Techniques taught in the Institute. These data were gathered as part of the evaluation's pilot study of instructors who participated in the Institute during 1986-87. The second type of data collected in the evaluation concerned participants and trainers' perceptions about the utility and design of the Institute. Institute participants were asked to assess the Institute's overall structure and to indicate their areas of improvement. Institute trainers were also surveyed about similar topics, and were asked to recommend changes in the structure and content of materials used in the training sessions.

Evaluation Findings

Pilot Study. A pilot study of 44 Institute participants was undertaken in order to: 1) determine participants' growth in using appropriate classroom management strategies and ESL Techniques; 2) assess the results of the coaching process used during 1986-87; and 3) obtain information for the final revision of the Institute's design and training materials scheduled for 1987-88. Two data collection methods were used to gather information for the pilot study, which utilized a pre-post design. The first was observations of Institute participants teaching their own ESL classes, both prior to and after they had attended the Institute sessions. Three instruments were used in this observation process: 1) ESL Institute Feedback Forms, 2) Classroom Observation Form, and 3) Teaching Improvement Process (T.I.P.)[1]. The second method was interviews with the instructors who had been observed.

The analyses of data collected during the evaluation's pilot study indicated that the Institute has been successful in meeting its objectives of increasing participants'--i.e.,

---

1. The ESL Institute Feedback Form and Classroom Observation Form were developed by DNAE, ACSA, Foundation for Educational Administration, 1985. The T.1.P. was developed by the CBAE Staff Development Project, San Francisco State University Foundation, Inc., 1987.

instructors--abilities to: 1) use specific ESL Techniques; 2) use the sequential steps in these techniques; and 3) use CBAE classroom management strategies. The Institute participants who implemented the coaching process during 1986-87 found the process useful for improving their instructional skills, and for building collegial relationships within their own agencies. Critical to the success of the coaching process has been the support provided to the Institute participants by agency administrators. Participants who had both prior experience with the ESL techniques and strong agency support were more likely to benefit from coaching. Less experienced instructors found it difficult to learn new instructional techniques along with the coaching process.

Participants' and Trainers' Perceptions. Both Institute participants and trainers were asked to assess the design and content of the Institute, and to suggest refinements that could be made. Overall, instructors who participated in the 1986-87 ESL Institutes found the sessions to be well-designed and well-paced. They felt that the trainers were skilled in conveying the Institute's underlying concepts, and used the training support materials effectively.

In terms of the volume of material covered during the sessions, participants suggested that the number of ESL Techniques taught in the Institute be reduced, so that the material could be covered in greater depth. Finally, participants found the

modeling of Techniques, both live and through video, and the opportunities to practice and receive feedback about their use of the Techniques the most beneficial aspects of the Institute sessions.

Institute trainers reported that the two Institute colloquia held during 1986-87 were invaluable opportunities for skill refinement and enhancement. Of particular help were sessions concerning the modeling of ESL Techniques and the demonstration of Feedback strategies.

Future Activities

The evaluation's findings suggested a number of areas that should be addressed during 1987-88, in order to prepare the ESL Institute for dissemination. The three types of activities that will be undertaken are: 1) refinement of the Institute's design and content, 2) design of a transfer process that can be used to prepare adult education agencies for participation in the Institute, and 3) creation of reinforcement activities for enhancing skill building and skill retention of Institute participants.

For the full report of the Evaluation Study, contact:
K. Lynn Savage, Director, ESL Teacher Institute
c/o DNAE, 1575 Old Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, CA 94010

Tel. within California: (800) 672-3494
Tel. outside California: (415) 692-2956

PREFACE

This report describes the results of an evaluation of the 1986-1987 English-As-a-Second Language (ESL) Teacher Institute. The objective of the evaluation was to determine the ESL Institute's impact on participants' abilities to use specific ESL instructional techniques, as well as their capacities to implement competency-based adult education classroom management methods.

As a competency-based staff development program, the ESL Institute has been designed to improve the skills of instructors with limited or no experience teaching ESL or adult basic education classes. As well, the Institute--through its coaching process--can enhance the capabilities of experienced ESL instructors. This report describes the ways in which the Institute has been successful both in increasing instructors' abilities to use ESL techniques, and in managing competency-based instructional settings.

During the course of the year-long evaluation, many individuals assisted the evaluation teams in the design and data collection phases of the effort. Our data collection activities would not have been possible without the cooperation and support of the instructors who participated in the ESL Institute during 1986-1987. The evaluation team is indebted to these individuals. Special thanks are given to the ESL Institute

Institute trainers, who conducted the Institute sessions and who participated in the two ESL colloquia held during the evaluation period. Their suggestions about refinement of Institute training materials greatly assisted the formative evaluation effort.

Critical to the evaluation's efforts was the assistance given by four individuals who participated in the data collection process. Our gratitude is extended to: Leann Howard, San Diego Community College District; Holda Dorsey, Hacienda-La Puente Unified School District; Greta Kojima, Los Angeles Unified School District; and Bea Moreno, Redlands Unified School District.

Several members of the California Department of Education's Youth, Adult, and Alternative Educational Services have supported the evaluation team throughout the year. Our appreciation is extended to Richard Stiles, who assisted in the design of the study and who reviewed the draft report; and to Carlos Gonzales, Edda Caraballo-Browne, and Jerry Kilbert, who participated in the ESL Institute colloquia.

Finally, thanks are given to Jane Zinner, director of the Dissemination Network for Adult Educators--a California State Department of Education-funded project under federal P.L. 91-230, Section 310--under whose auspices this evaluation was conducted. Her advice and support throughout the evaluation are much appreciated.

The members of the team who conducted the evaluation and prepared this report are: Judith A. Alamprese, external consultant to the Institute and Autumn Keltner, California-based consultant to the Institute. K. Lynn Savage, Director of the ESL Institute, provided guidance throughout the evaluation and prepared Section II of the report, which describes the Institute's development and implementation. Special thanks are given to Julie Raquel, who was responsible for the final production of the report. The views and conclusions presented in this report are those of the authors, and do not represent the California Department of Education or the U. S. Department of Education.

Executive Summary

The ESL Teacher Institute

Created in 1980, the English-As-a-Second-Language (ESL) Teacher Institute is a staff development program for preparing instructors to use ESL techniques and materials. The Institute has been designed for inexperienced instructors of ESL in adult basic education as well as for individuals who have not previously taught ESL or adults.

The Institute's development has occurred in three stages: 1) the provision of Core Workshops, 2) the incorporation of a competency-based adult education approach in the Workshops, and 3) the inclusion of classroom management and coaching strategies into an ESL Institute. During the first stage of the program, 1980-1982, training was provided through the ESL Core Workshops. The workshops, offered for 12 hours over a weekend, focused on the development of four language skills--listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Workshop participants were taught how to use specific ESL instructional techniques--e.g., dialogues and communicative drills--that were reflective of state-of-the-art practice in ESL.

Refinement of the Core Workshops continued during an intermediary stage of development, 1982-1985, during which time the training design and content were revised. The length of the workshops shifted from 12 hours offered over two days to a one-

day, eight-hour session. The major change was in the content of the workshops, which were refined to include a competency-based adult education approach.

The third stage of development began in 1985, with the creation of the current ESL Institute. During this period, the training design changed from an eight-hour session to three four-hour sessions, with up to one-month intervals between sessions. The content of the Institute was also expanded, such that the Institute currently focuses on the development of three types of skills: 1) ESL instructional techniques, 2) competency-based classroom management strategies, and 3) coaching techniques. In addition to refinements in design and content, the training process was revised to include the standardization of training materials and demonstration of instructional techniques. As well, on-going staff development has been provided for ESL Institute trainers through the provision of colloquia, which are opportunities for trainers to refine and renew their training skills.

Evaluation of the ESL Institute

As the development and refinement of the ESL Institute progressed, staff from the Institute and California State Department of Education were interested in assessing the effects of the Institute on improving instructors' skills in

utilizing ESL Techniques, and in enhancing their overall instructional abilities. There also was a desire to understand the Institute trainers' perceptions about their own skill development. Thus, an evaluation of the 1986-87 ESL Institute was undertaken, in order to determine the Institute's impact on:

* Instructors' abilities to use ESL Techniques;
* Instructors' abilities to use the sequential steps in Techniques (e.g., techniques for listening, speaking, and reading);
* Instructors' capacities to use Competency-Based Adult Education (CBAE) classroom management methods; and
* Instructors' and trainers perceptions about the acquisition of instructional skills through systematic training and reinforcement.

In order to assess the impact of the Institute on its participants and trainers, two types of data were collected during 1986-87. The first focused on participants' abilities to conduct an appropriate CBAE lesson, utilizing the ESL Techniques taught in the Institute. These data were gathered as part of the evaluation's pilot study of instructors who participated in the Institute during 1986-87. The second type of data collected in the evaluation concerned participants and trainers' perceptions about the utility and design of the Institute. Institute participants were asked to assess the Institute's overall structure and to indicate their areas of

improvement. Institute trainers were also surveyed about similar topics, and were asked to recommend changes in the structure and content of materials used in the training sessions.

Evaluation Findings

Pilot Study. A pilot study of 44 Institute participants was undertaken in order to: 1) determine participants' growth in using appropriate classroom management strategies and ESL Techniques; 2) assess the results of the coaching process used during 1986-87; and 3) obtain information for the final revision of the Institute's design and training materials scheduled for 1987-88. Two data collection methods were used to gather information for the pilot study, which utilized a pre-post design. The first was observations of Institute participants teaching their own ESL classes, both prior to and after they had attended the Institute sessions. Three instruments were used in this observation process: 1) ESL Institute Feedback Forms, 2) Classroom Observation Form, and 3) Teaching Improvement Process (T.I.P.)[1]. The second method was interviews with the instructors who had been observed.

---

1. The ESL Teacher Institute Feedback Form and Classroom Observation Form were developed by DNAE, ACSA, Foundation for Educational Administration, 1985. The T.I.P. was developed by the CBAE Staff Development Project, San Francisco State University Foundation, Inc., 1987.

The analyses of data collected during the evaluation's pilot study indicated that the Institute has been successful in meeting its objectives of increasing participants'--i.e., instructors--abilities to: 1) use specific ESL Techniques; 2) use the sequential steps in these techniques; and 3) use CBAE classroom management strategies. The Institute participants who implemented the coaching process during 1986-87 found the process useful for improving their instructional skills, and for building collegial relationships within their own agencies. Critical to the success of the coaching process has been the support provided to the Institute participants by agency administrators. Participants who had both prior experience with the ESL techniques and strong agency support were more likely to benefit from coaching. Less experienced instructors found it difficult to learn new instructional techniques along with the coaching process.

Participants' and Trainers' Perceptions. Both Institute participants and trainers were asked to assess the design and content of the Institute, and to suggest refinements that could be made. Overall, instructors who participated in the 1986-87 ESL Institutes found the sessions to be well-designed and well-paced. They felt that the trainers were skilled in conveying the Institute's underlying concepts, and used the training support materials effectively.

In terms of the volume of material covered during the sessions, participants suggested that the number of ESL Techniques taught in the Institute be reduced, so that the material could be covered in greater depth. Finally, participants found the modeling of Techniques, both live and through video, and the opportunities to practice and receive feedback about their use of the Techniques the most beneficial aspects of the Institute sessions.

Institute trainers reported that the two Institute colloquia held during 1986-87 were invaluable opportunities for skill refinement and enhancement. Of particular help were sessions concerning the modeling of ESL Techniques and the demonstration of Feedback strategies.

Future Activities

The evaluation's findings suggested a number of areas that should be addressed during 1987-88, in order to prepare the ESL Institute for dissemination. The three types of activities that will be undertaken are: 1) refinement of the Institute's design and content, 2) design of a transfer process that can be used to prepare adult education agencies for participation in the Institute, and 3) creation of reinforcement activities for enhancing skill building and skill retention of Institute participants.

CONTENTS

PREFACE i

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv

Section
I. INTRODUCTION 1

Overview of the ESL Institute 1
Purpose of the Evaluation 2
Organization of the Report 3

II. THE INSTITUTE 4

A. Historical Development 4
Overview 4
Philosophy 4
Early Development 5
Intermediary Stage 7
Current Development 8
B. Summary of 1986-87 13
The Institute 13
The Training of Trainers 15

III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY 16

Introduction 16
Pilot Study Design and Data Collection Methods. .17
Collection of Perceptual Information. 23

IV. THE ESL INSTITUTE'S IMPACT 26

Introduction 26
Development of Institute Participants' Instructional Skills 26
Participants' and Trainers' Perceptions of the Institute. 40

V. SUMMARY AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES 42

Overview 42
Institute Design and Content 43
Organizational Conditions for Implementation . .45
Skill Reinforcement 46

CONTENTS

Appendix

A. ESL Techniques Feedback Forms A-1
B. Classroom Observation Form B-1
T.I.P. Summary Form B-3
C. ESL Teacher Institute Evaluation Forms C-1
D. Trainers' Colloquium Evaluation Forms D-1

TABLES

1. Historical Development of the Institute 12
2. Comparison of Instructors' Performance Using ESL Techniques Before and After Participating in the Institute 31
3. Comparison of Observations of Instructors' Lesson Management Activities Before and After Participation In the Institute. 34
4. Comparison of Observations of Instructors' Use of CBAE Classroom Management Strategies Before and After Their Participation in the ESL Institute 36

VIGNETTE

1. Agency Support 39

I. INTRODUCTION

Overview of the ESL Institute

The English-As-a-Second Language (ESL) Teacher Institute which began in 1980 as the ESL Core Workshops, has been designed to provide staff training for instructors with no prior experience teaching ESL or adult basic education. The workshops originally were created because of these existing conditions in Adult Education: 1) high faculty turnover, 2) the use of primarily part-time faculty, and 3) the lack of faculty with formal training in adult education.

The original core workshops--conducted from 1980-1983--trained instructors to use ESL techniques and materials. In 1985, the focus of the workshops shifted to include training on the use of the competency-based adult education (CBAE) process. The content of the workshops was modified so that the needs of instructors with limited knowledge of CBAE, ESL or adult education could be met. In the fall of 1986, the Core Workshops became the ESL Institute. The name change signified modifications in training time--from a single one and one-half day workshop to three sessions held over a six week period--as well as in content. The ESL Institute training curriculum has been expanded to include an emphasis on measuring and reinforcing ESL instructional skills.

Purpose of the Evaluation

As the development of the ESL Institute continued throughout the 1980's, the need to assess the Institute's impact became apparent to the Institute's designers and the State Department of Education staff. They wanted to learn about the Institute's effects, both on improving instructors' skills in utilizing ESL techniques and on enhancing their overall instructional abilities. In addition, there was an interest in understanding the Institute trainers' perceptions about their own skill development, as the training design had been refined over time. Thus, an evaluation of the 1986-87 ESL Institute was initiated in September 1986, in order to determine the Institute's impact on:

1. Instructors' ability to use ESL techniques;
2. Instructors' abilities to use the sequential steps in specific ESL techniques (e.g., techniques for listening, speaking, and reading);
3. Instructors' capacities to use CBAE classroom management methods; and
4. Instructors' and trainers' perceptions about the acquisition of instructional skills through systematic training and reinforcement.

Specifically, this evaluation was designed to document the Institute's effects on instructors' instructional skills, by comparing their abilities to conduct an appropriate ESL lesson before and after their participation in the Institute. Furthermore, the evaluation was structured to provide information about Institute trainers' and participants' experiences utilizing the skill reinforcement process--a key method for enhancing learning.

In order to have a study approach that combined evaluation expertise with substantive knowledge about ESL, two consultants were asked to design and implement the evaluation. Judith Alamprese, a Washington, D.C.-based consultant who was knowledgeable about adult education programs in California and who has experience in developing and evaluating Adult Education training programs, was joined by Autumn Keltner, a California-based consultant who has many years experience working with Adult Basic Education and English-As-a-Second Language programs in California. These consultants worked with the Institute staff in carrying out all phases of the evaluation.

Organization of the Report

This report presents the results of the year-long evaluation of the ESL Institute. Section II of the report describes the historical development of the Institute, with particular attention to the evolution of the Institute's philosophy and design. Also included in Section II is a summary of the Institute's activities during 1986-87. Section III describes the methodology used in the evaluation, and Section IV discusses the evaluation's results. Finally, presented in Section V is a summary of the evaluation's conclusions and the Institute refinement activities that will be undertaken during 1987-88.

II. THE ESL INSTITUTE

A. Historical Development

Overview

There have been three distinct stages in the development of the ESL Institute: 1) the early Core Workshops, 2) an intermediary stage in which a competency-based philosophy was incorporated, and 3) the current ESL Institute. This section first describes the philosophy of the Institute, which has remained consistent throughout the three stages. Next, the historical development is summarized, highlighting significant developments at each of the three stages. The following aspects are discussed for the first and third third stages: a) design, b) content focus, and c) training.

Philosophy

Since its beginning in the fall of 1980, the ESL Institute has remained consistent in certain principles related to the content, structure, and process of training.

The first set of principles relate to the content of training. These principles are that: 1) teaching is a skill which can be taught; 2) learning is a skill that requires practice and feedback; and 3) training content must be relevant to the needs of the participants. In the case of the Institute, relevance means that the training must be able to be applied for use with adult students in open entry/open-exit programs.

The second set of principles relate to the structure. These principles are that: 1) trainers be knowledgeable about the local context and relate to the experiences of those they are training 2) the desire to have consistent outcomes across training teams requires standardization in training materials and the delivery of training; and 3) the training should reflect the philosophy of the teaching being advocated. In the case of the Institute, this has meant that as expectations of the performance of the Institute participants have increased--i.e., the shift to using a competency-based teaching process--so have the expectations of the trainers.

The third set of principles relates to training process. They are: 1) training should be responsive to the changing needs of instructors, which vary with the student population; and 2) throughout the development and implementation of training, there needs to be a conscious process to involve both trainers and external consultants, in order to create a product that is the combined thinking of the group.

Early Development

This stage covers the first two years of the Institute--i.e., the implementation of the Core Workshops--from the fall of 1980 through the spring of 1982. During this stage there were significant developments in design, content focus, and training.

Design. The original Core Workshops were 12 hours, offered on a Friday and Saturday. The agenda was divided into five nearly-equal time blocks. Four blocks focused on the development of the four language skills--listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The fifth concerned the selection and adaptation of a text. Each section, except writing, concluded with a task, in that participants were expected to work with the techniques and materials which had been either demonstrated or discussed by the trainers.

Content Focus. The major focus of the Core Workshops was on instructional techniques and materials. An underlying assumption was that part-time faculty--with limited preparation time--were more apt to use textbooks rather than to produce original instructional materials. Therefore, the teaching of techniques selected for training were those with the greatest visibility in commercially-available materials. Whether demonstrated or discussed, the presentation of each technique included a reference to student texts or professional resources relevant to the technique.

The majority of textbooks being used at the time that the Core Workshops were being developed reflected the audio-lingual/habit-formation approach to developing language proficiency. Therefore, the majority of techniques covered represented this methodological approach--e.g., dialogues; mechanical, meaningful, and communicative drills.

Training. In the first year of the Core Workshops, there was one "lead" trainer who provided continuity from workshop to workshop. The second trainer was from the region in which the workshop was held. After the first year, the regional trainer then became the lead and worked with a new trainer, also from within the region where the training took place. The original lead trainer assumed a management function. The training materials provided to the workshop participants were the same across regions.

Intermediary Stage

This stage covers the period from the fall of 1982 through the spring of 1985. During this stage, the design was one eight-hour session held on a Saturday--a shift from the early design of 12 hours of training. The major change was in content. The concept of a competency-based approach was incorporated into the sessions in order to support the policy of the Adult Education Unit of the California State Department of Education. This official policy required that programs receiving Section 306 monies be competency based, and emphasized the "basic and life skills necessary . . . to function proficiently in society."

Incorporating a competency-based approach was congruent with language-acquisition research, which indicates that effective instruction involves teaching in context. Research supports the use of a language-learning syllabus that places

Training. In the first year of the Core Workshops, there was one "lead" trainer who provided continuity from workshop to workshop. The second trainer was from the region in which the workshop was held. After the first year, the regional trainer then became the lead and worked with a new trainer, also from within the region where the training took place. The original lead trainer assumed a management function. The training materials provided to the workshop participants were the same across regions.

Intermediary Stage

This stage covers the period from the fall of 1982 through the spring of 1985. During this stage, the design was one eight-hour session held on a Saturday--a shift from the early design of 12 hours of training. The major change was in content. The concept of a competency-based approach was incorporated into the sessions in order to support the policy of the Adult Education Unit of the California State Department of Education. This official policy required that programs receiving Section 306 monies be competency based, and emphasized the "basic and life skills necessary . . . to function proficiently in society."

Incorporating a competency-based approach was congruent with language-acquisition research, which indicates that effective instruction involves teaching in context. Research supports the use of a language-learning syllabus that places

language structures in contexts relevant to student need. Language objectives became enabling objectives--the means to the students' goals, not goals in themselves. Thus, the major change during the intermediary stage of development--the change to competency based--not only reflected the findings of research in language acquisition and in adult education, but also provided support for the policy of adult education in California.

Current Development

The current stage of development, known as the ESL Institute, began in the fall of 1985. During this stage, there have been significant changes in design, content and training.

Design. The current Institute design is three four-hour sessions. There is a week or more between sessions. During each session two to four modules have been taught. In lower-level classes, a greater percentage of time is spent on listening and speaking than on reading and writing. Because most participants teach lower-level classes, more time--nearly all of one session--has been devoted to techniques that develop speaking skills. The concluding activity of each module is a task, which requires participants to apply what they have learned from the trainers to their own teaching situations.

Content Focus. The content of the current ESL Institute is divided into three major categories: 1) ESL instructional techniques, 2) competency-based classroom management procedures and 3) coaching. The third category--coaching--is a process that

provides Institute participants opportunities for peer interaction, and focuses on skills that are being performed, rather than on affective elements in the instructional process.

The coaching model used in the Institute, derived from a industry-based training program, is a process whereby participants give feedback to each other about the use of specific skills requiring a set of procedures. An essential element to the Institute's coaching process as used in the Institute is the Feedback Forms. The Feedback Forms identify the steps within an ESL instructional technique, which are listed sequentially. The Forms also present teaching options for each step. One Feedback Form was developed for each technique that is taught in the Institute. The Feedback Forms are contained in Appendix A.

In addition to the incorporation of coaching, the Institute formalized the use of a competency-based approach during this stage. First, a decision was made to place all examples of techniques into a life skills situation. Second, modules were developed that focus on specific aspects of the competency-based approach. These modules are: a) "Analysis of a Competency-Based Adult Education/ESL Lesson," b) "Needs Assessment," c) "Supplementing a Text," and d) "Lesson Planning."

A third change in content focus during this stage of development has been the addition of new techniques and the deletion of some existing techniques in the Institute.

Commercially-developed materials were beginning to reflect the communicative and language acquisition approaches to developing language proficiency. Therefore, the Institute incorporated techniques representing these methodologies (e.g., information gap, early production, problem solving).

With the evaluation of the Institute, its content focus has shifted from a single focus to three distinct categories. With this change, it became necessary to prioritize and delete techniques. The incorporation of a competency-based approach provided the rationale for deletion of certain techniques. Specifically, the rationale was to: 1) delete the techniques that focus primarily on building academic skills (e.g., listening to lectures, writing compositions), and 2) delete the techniques that focus on discrete language skills and therefore are more difficult to teach in context (e.g., minimal pairs, transformation drills).

Training. During the current stage of development of the ESL Institute, there have been three major refinements in training: 1) standardization of training materials, 2) standardization of the demonstration of techniques, and 3) provision of colloquia that focus on the training of the trainers.

Until 1985, the major form of standardization for training was through the materials provided to participants. In order to ensure that outcomes were the same for participants across the training teams, a training guide was developed. The guide presents the specific information that should be delivered in

training sessions. It identifies the goal of each training module, offers a sequence of steps to reach that goal, and provides suggestions for one or more activities to accomplish a step. The guide also contains related support materials, such as transparencies, worksheets, and visuals.

The second major change in the Institute training process was development of videos, which replace the live demonstrations of techniques. Through the use of videos, there is consistency in demonstration across training teams, and therefore, across regions. Their use assures that no steps are deleted in the demonstration of the technique, and that the same option is used in demonstrating each step. The videos also provide the opportunity for trainers to repeat a portion of a demonstration about which participants may have questions. By using videos, trainers have been able to focus on the training of participants, rather than on their own delivery of the demonstration.

The third change in training has been the incorporation of the colloquia for trainers. At least one colloquium is held at the end of each year of training. The major goal of the colloquia is to ensure consistency in training. In addition, they provide opportunities for trainers to share their training experiences from the preceding year, to reach consensus on areas that need refinement, and to hone their own skills.

Table 1 summarizes the historical development of the Institute.

TABLE 1

Historical Development of the Institute

Design	Content	Training
	Early Development (1980-1982)	
Originally 12 hours, Friday evening and all-day Saturday; then one session, one weekend day for eight hours.	• Techniques: -listening -speaking -reading -writing • Adapting a Text	• A Training Team: originally one lead constant between regions and one from within the region; then two trainers within the region, one lead with experience and one new; • Training Process: demonstration and task; • Standardized materials for participants
	Intermediary Stage (1982-1985) • Added CBE Concept	
	Current Development (1985-Present)	
Three sessions, each session four hours; 1-3 weeks between sessions	• Added CBE modules, including lesson planning; • Presented each technique in a life skills context • Added techniques representing the communicative and language acquisition methodologies; • Deleted writing section; • Added Feedback Forms; • Added reinforcement through coaching; • Reduced number of techniques covered.	• Added materials for trainers; • Incorporated demonstration by video; • Added Colloquia.

B. Summary of 1986-87

The Institute Process and Content

During 1986-87, six Institutes were regionally available to teachers from any adult education agency in the region. A seventh was offered locally--open only to instructors from a single adult education agency. A total of 249 persons attended one or more sessions. A total of 154 persons completed all three sessions.

The 1986-87 Institute consisted of three four-hour sessions, one or more weeks apart. The objectives for Session I were: 1) to identify the key components of a CBAE/ESL lesson, 2) to identify the steps used in coaching, and 3) to increase skills in using techniques that develop listening. The goal for Session II was to increase skills of participants in using techniques that develop the speaking skills of their students. This included the objectives of recognizing a speaking skills continuum, moving from teacher-centered to student-centered activities, and distinguishing between techniques for lower-level and higher-level students. The objectives for Session III were to increase the skills of participants in using techniques that develop the reading skills of their students, and to implement the coaching process.

The number of techniques taught in each skill area--listening, speaking, and reading--varied. In the area of listening, there were two examples of one technique--Focused

Listening--one for lower-level and one for higher-level students. The reading skill area had two techniques, Language Experience for lower-level, less-literate students and Reading for higher-level, more-literate students.

The techniques for developing speaking skills in the 1986-87 Institute were on a continuum from lower level to higher level and represented the following choices: 1) choices in learning styles, by including techniques especially effective with language acquirers, as well as techniques especially effective with language learners; 2) choices in focus, by including techniques that focus on meaning, as well as techniques that focus on accuracy; and 3) choices in control, by including techniques that are student centered, as well as ones that are teacher centered.

The speaking techniques, on a continuum from those requiring the least English to those requiring the most English, were Early Production, Drills, Dialogue, Pair Practice, Information Gap, Role Play, and Language Generating. Early Production appeals to language acquirers, focuses on meaning, and is, initially, teacher centered, but can move to student centered. Drills focus on accuracy, appeal to language learners, and usually are teacher centered. Dialogue appeals to language learners, usually focuses on accuracy, but in a context which provides meaning and is, most often, teacher centered, but can move to student centered. Pair Practice is student centered, may focus on accuracy or communication, and may appeal to language learners or language

acquirers, depending on the way in which an instructor uses it. Information Gap also can appeal to language acquirers or language learners, depending on the way in which a teacher uses it; it focuses on meaning and is student centered. Both Role Play and Language Generating appeal to language acquirers, focus on meaning, and are student centered.

The Training of Trainers

Two colloquia were held in 1986-87, one in May and one in August. Each was one and one half days long. The May colloquium provided trainers with an opportunity to share their previous year's experiences and to suggest areas for refining the Institute, based on their experiences. It also included analysis of specific techniques demonstrated by video, that is, Language Experience and Information Gap/Pair Practice. This analysis resulted in group consensus on essential steps in the technique, refinement of the related feedback forms, and identification of a process for using the videos in training.

At the August colloquium, trainers analyzed video demonstrations of three additional techniques: Dialogue, Early Production, and Problem Solving. The August colloquium also addressed facilitation behavior, provided opportunity for trainers to facilitate, and gave structured feedback to trainers on their facilitation skills.

III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In order to assess the impact of the Institute on its participants and trainers, an evaluation was designed that involved the collection of two types of data. The first type of data focused on participants' abilities to conduct an appropriate Competency-Based Adult Education (CBAE) lesson, utilizing the ESL techniques taught in the Institute. These data were gathered as part of the evaluation's pilot study of instructors who participated in the Institute during 1986-87.

The second type of data collected in the evaluation concerned participants' and trainers' perceptions about the utility and design of the Institute. Instructors who attended the training sessions were asked to assess the institute's overall structure and to indicate the areas in which they perceived they had grown. The Institute's trainers, who conducted the training sessions and participated in the ESL Institute Colloquia, were surveyed about similar topics and were asked to recommend changes in the content and structure of materials used in the training sessions.

Thus, the evaluation had two components that corresponded to the two types of data that were collected. The first component was the pilot study, which tracked the progress of the Institute participants in developing their instructional skills. The second component involved the collection of

perceptual information from Institute participants and trainers, about their overall assessment of the design of the Institute and the benefits they derived from participating in it.

Pilot Study Design and Data Collection Methods

Purposes. In order to assess the ESL Institute effects on improving instructors' abilities to conduct a CBAE lesson, a pilot study of a sample of Institute participants was undertaken during 1986-87. The pilot study had three main purposes: 1) to determine participants' growth in using appropriate classroom management strategies and ESL instructional techniques; 2) to assess the results of the implementation of the coaching process, which had been incorporated into the Institute's design during 1986-87; and 3) to obtain information for the final revision of the Institute's design, training materials, and data collection methods, which would be undertaken during 1987-88.

A pre-post design was utilized in the pilot study. The design was chosen in order to determine the Institute's effects on its participants through the collection of data at two points in time. These were prior to the first session of the Institute and after the third, or final, session of the Institute. The assumption was that the Institute participants would improve their abilities to conduct a CBAE lesson--utilizing ESL instructional techniques--as a result of attending the three Institute sessions, and would implement what they learned in these sessions with reinforcement and feedback provided by a peer coach located in the same adult education agency.

Two data collection methods were used to gather information for the pilot study. The first was observations of the Institute participants--i.e., instructors--conducting ESL classes, both prior to and after they attended the three Institute sessions. The second was interviews with the instructors who had been observed. Each of these methods is described below.

Instructor Observations. Instructors who participated in the pilot study were observed for two purposes: 1) to determine their progress in using the ESL techniques that they had been taught in the Institute, and 2) to assess their abilities to conduct an appropriate CBAE lesson.

Three instruments were used by trained observers to collect information about the purposes of the pilot study described above. The first was the ESL Institute Feedback Form--developed by the Institute staff and trainers--which is a checklist of the essential steps, listed in sequence, for each of the ESL Techniques. The observers used the Feedback Forms for eight of the 11 ESL Techniques, to document the instructors' abilities to perform the techniques that they had learned during the Institute sessions (the eight Techniques are those that the instructors chose to use at the time during which they were observed). Forms for these eight techniques--i.e., Role Play, Focused Listening, Early Production, Reading, Drills, Language Generating, Dialogues, and Pair Practice--are presented in Appendix A.

The second instrument was the Classroom Observation Form, also developed by the Institute staff, which is a form for documenting: a) the instructors' use of a lesson plan in conducting a lesson; b) instructors' use of a competency objective to focus a lesson; c) the language skills that are taught in the lesson; and d) the stages of the lesson and the ESL techniques that are used during each stage.

Two categories of information from the Classroom Observation Form were utilized in the evaluation in order to assess the instructors' abilities to conduct a CBAE lesson. These were: 1) whether the instructor used a lesson plan; and b) whether they used a competency objective to focus the lesson. The process for collecting the other types of information on this form--the use of language skills and the stages of a lesson--requires further refinement before the information can be examined for analytic purposes.

The third observation instrument was the Teaching Improvement Process (T.I.P.)--created by the CBAE Staff Development Project staff--which is a process for recording instructors' implementation of CBAE classroom management strategies. The T.I.P. was used in the ESL Institute evaluation as part of a cooperative effort between the Institute and the Staff Development Project to conduct further field testing of the instrument. Two categories on the T.I.P were analyzed for the Institute evaluation: 1) the Overall Organization of Learning Activity Rating and 2) the Classroom Grouping Strategies Rating.

These categories were chosen because they reflected the training material presented in the Institute, and they complemented the information collected with the Classroom Observation Form. Copies of the Classroom Observation Form and the T.I.P. Summary Form are found in Appendix B.

The instruments described above were used by trained observers in collecting the data for the evaluation. These observers were five individuals experienced in the instructional methods taught in the ESL Institute, and familiar with the Adult Education agencies in which the Institute participants taught. One observer, Autumn Keltner, conducted the majority of the observations and coordinated the training and data collection schedules of the observers. All of the observers participated in two training sessions prior to the beginning of the evaluation. One session was conducted by the Institute Director, Lynn Savage, and Autumn Keltner. This session trained observers to collect data using the ESL Techniques Feedback Forms and the Classroom Observation Form, as well as to interview participants after the Institute sessions. The CBAE Staff Development Project staff held the other session, in which the observers were taught how to use the T.I.P. In order to establish reliability in the observation process, Autumn Keltner either accompanied each observer on at least one observation visit after the training, or reviewed the instruments by other observers who conducted paired observations. This step was undertaken in order to ensure that the data collection process was consistent among all observers.

Observations of the pilot study instructors--e.g., Institute participants--conducting ESL classes were made at a maximum of two weeks prior to the first session. Each observer usually met with the instructor to be observed prior to class, in order to set the instructor at ease and to obtain a general overview about the activities to be carried out. If a meeting prior to the observation was not possible, then the observer held a debriefing session with the instructor after the class, to review what had taken place during the instructional session. Each observation was approximately one hour in length.

In conducting the observation sessions, the observers sat in the back of the classroom in order to record both the instructors' actions and the students' behaviors. During the class, the observers prepared an anecdotal record, which was a detailed narrative documentation of the activities they observed in the classroom--including both instructors' and students' behaviors--as well as the length of time spent on each task. The anecdotal record was used so that observers could capture as much detail and depth of activity as possible during the observation period. After the class, the observers referred to the information documented in the anecdotal record in completing the three types of observation forms described above.

Instructor Post-Institute Interview. Observers met with each instructor who participated in the pilot study to conduct a Post-Institute Observation Interview. The purposes of this interview, which was held in conjunction with the second class-

room observation--eight to 12 weeks after the Institute's third session--were to ascertain: a) the instructor's feelings about the design and content of the Institute sessions; b) whether coaching had taken place between Institute sessions and, if so, the instructor's reactions to the coaching process; and c) the instructor's suggestions for refining the Institute content and process. The observers discussed each of these topics with the instructors at the conclusion of the classroom observation session. The interviews averaged approximately 20 minutes in length.

In addition to the instructor interviews, the observers also met with the agency administrators when they were available. During these interviews, the observers asked administrators about their perceptions concerning changes in their instructors as a result of their participation in the Institute.

Sample. The sample for the pilot study was 44 instructors who participated in the ESL Institute during 1986-87. These instructors--drawn from five of the seven Institutes--represented 15 State-funded Adult Education agencies. In order to be eligible for the pilot study, an instructor had to: a) have taught ESL no more than two years--in order to ensure that the study participants were the Institute's target population and b) be located in an agency in which a peer coach was available. Thus, only pairs of instructors who could coach each other were selected for the pilot study.

From the original sample of 44 instructors, pre and post observations were completed for 29 instructors. Fifteen of the 44 observations were unable to be completed because instructors were reassigned, had a change in class time, or were ill; or because the observer was not available. Of the 29 pre and post observations, nine were observations in which an ESL Technique Feedback Form could not be used in one of the observations--eight during the pre observations and one during the post observations. This situation occurred when the instructor was not using a discernable method that corresponded to an ESL Technique. Of the remaining 20 observations, 12 were observations in which the same ESL Techniques Form was used during the pre and post observations. The other eight observations were ones in which different ESL Techniques Forms were used during the pre and post observations. Given that it was difficult or impossible to require instructors to use the same technique in the two classes during which they were to be observed, it was fortuitous that 12 of the 20 observations had matched pairs of techniques.

Collection of Perceptual Information

Instructor Perceptions. After each of the three sessions of the seven ESL Institutes conducted during 1986-87, participants were surveyed concerning their feelings about the overall design and content of the Institute. They also were asked whether they felt they had improved their skills during each session--e.g.,

Session I, use of focused listening activities; Session II, use of student-centered activities, and Session III, use of peer coach for feedback. The response rate varied slightly with each session of the Institute, from 173 for the overall Institute responses for the first sessions, to 161 for the overall responses for the third session. The survey form--the ESL Teacher Institute Evaluation Form--contained ten questions concerning the design and content of the Institute, and from four to six ratings per session concerning perceived growth according to the session's objectives. The Institute trainers administered this anonymous evaluation to participants at the conclusion of each of the three Institute sessions. Copies of the three evaluation forms, one from each of the sessions, are presented in Appendix C.

Trainer Perceptions. The ESL Institute trainers attended two Institute Colloquia during 1986-87. The first was held in May 1987 and the second in August 1987. These colloquia served as staff development opportunities for the Institute trainers, in order to reinforce the need for standardization in consistency of training. In addition, the trainers were asked to identify the areas of the Institute--i.e., design, content, and process--that needed refinement, based on their training experiences during 1986-87.

After each Colloquium, trainers completed evaluation forms that solicited their perceptions concerning the design and focus of the Institute, and the materials used. Finally, trainers were asked to suggest improvements that could be made in the Institute's content and process. Copies of the two evaluation forms used during the May and August colloquia are presented in Appendix D.

IV. THE ESL INSTITUTE'S IMPACT

Introduction

The data collected for the two components of the evaluation--the pilot study of Institute participants' skill development, and the surveys of participants' and trainers' perceptions about the Institute's utility and design--were analyzed and the results examined to determine the success of the Institute in achieving its objectives during 1986-87. As well, these results were used to identify the Institute areas that will require refinement during 1987-88. The refinement process will ensure that the ESL Institute, as an intervention for developing and improving the instructional skills of ESL instructors, will be fully transferable to adult education agencies at the conclusion of the 1987-88 funding year.

This section presents the analysis procedures, results, and conclusions of the evaluation's data collection activities. Discussed are the two components of the evaluation noted above, as well as the specific areas within each component that correspond to the Institute's objectives.

Development of Institute Participants' Instructional Skills

Information about three aspects of participants' skill development was collected as part of the Institute evaluation. The aspects were: 1) instructors' abilities to use ESL techniques, 2) instructors' abilities to use the sequential steps in specific ESL techniques, and 3) instructors' capacities to use

CBAE classroom management methods. In addition to quantitative information regarding participants' skills, perceptual, or qualitative data, were gathered about participants' feelings concerning the coaching process, and the overall effects of the Institute in helping them build their skills.

Use of ESL Techniques. A major objective of the Institute is to promote good ESL instruction through the use of specific ESL teaching techniques. The three Institute sessions are designed to orient participants to a number of ESL Techniques, by giving participants opportunities both to observe the techniques being modeled and to practice the techniques--during the training and in between Institute sessions in their own classrooms.

In the evaluation, one measure of participants' use of ESL techniques was whether or not the observers could document that a technique was being performed during the observation sessions. Of the 29 completed pre and post observations that were conducted as part of the evaluation, 69 percent of the pre observations were ones in which specific ESL Techniques could be documented--as measured by the use of a technique Feedback Form. In the post observations, the percentage of classes in which observers were able to use a Technique Feedback Form increased to 90. These data provided some support concerning the Institute's effects on participants' abilities to conduct classes using ESL instructional techniques.

A second aspect of participants' instructional behaviors was the extent to which Institute participants increased the number of ESL techniques they used in a class over the course of the

Institute. During the Institute sessions, participants were encouraged to vary their instructional approaches by utilizing a variety of ESL Techniques that are appropriate for the content being covered in the class.

As a general measure of growth of participants' use of a variety of appropriate techniques, the number of ESL Techniques recorded by the observers was analyzed for the 20 pre and post observations in which specific Techniques could be documented. The analysis indicated that 35 percent of the participants used a greater number of techniques during their post observations; 40 percent used the same number of techniques in the pre and post Institute classes that were observed; and 25 percent of the participants used fewer techniques from pre to post. Of course, the number of techniques used during a class depends upon the content being taught, which could explain the differences in percentages of techniques being utilized. However, the results do show a slight increase in participants' use of more techniques from the pre to post observations, which could indicate that Institute participants are improving their abilities to incorporate a variety of instructional techniques in their teaching repertoires.

Use of Sequential Steps in ESL Techniques. As was discussed in Section III of this report, trained observers performed pre and post observations of Institute participants conducting ESL classes. At the conclusion of each class, the observer determined which of the ESL Techniques Feedback Forms

should be used to document the instructor's actions that had taken place during the class. The choice made by the observer depended on the instructional technique that the instructor appeared to be performing. In some instances, more than one technique was observed during a class period.

For the 20 complete pre and post observations from the pilot study that were analyzed for this evaluation, eight of the 11 ESL Techniques Feedback Forms were used by observers in their documentation of instructors' teaching activities. The three techniques that the observers did not see being performed--Language Experience, Problem Solving, and Information Gap--are those that are considered the most difficult to execute. It is probable that the instructors did not perform the more advanced techniques because they were still developing their abilities to use the techniques that are less complex in structure.

Each of the ESL Techniques has a series of sequential steps that are required for the technique, and the Techniques Feedback Forms are designed such that the observers could indicate whether or not each step in the technique was performed. The Techniques Forms used in the 20 pre and post observations were analyzed by computing the percent correct steps performed for each technique, pre and post, and then by comparing the percent of correct steps performed between the pre and post observations. In addition, the difference between the percent of correct steps pre and post was computed.

Instructors observed in 12 of the 20 sets of classes pre and post the Institute used the same ESL Techniques in both observations. The remaining eight instructors used different ESL Techniques in the pre and post observations. The analysis of the 12 sets of observations--where there were matched pairs of techniques--indicated a substantial increase in the percent of steps performed correctly in the techniques between the pre and post observations. Table 2 presents these results. As is shown in the table, the average percent of correct steps per technique increased from 62 percent to 94 percent, with the average difference between pre and post observations being 32 percent. The analysis of the total sample of 20 pre and post observations--not controlling for the matched pairs of techniques--revealed similar results. In this analysis, the average percent of correct steps increased from 63 percent in the pre-observation to 92 percent in the post observation, with the average difference between pre and post being 31 percent.

This increase in instructors' abilities to perform specific ESL Techniques is due most likely to their practice of the Technique between the Institute sessions, and from the reinforcement that was given to instructors during coaching sessions. Data on the coaching activities for 16 of the 20 instructors were available. Of these 16 instructors, 12 were coached and coached other instructors, while four instructors did not participate in the coaching process. When the average percent of growth in using the correct steps in the techniques

TABLE 2

Comparison of Instructors' Performance
Using ESL Techniques
Before and After Participating in the Institute

Instructor	Pre Institute Percent Correct Steps per Technique	Post Institute Percent Correct Steps per Technique	Difference
1	40	100	60
2	75	88	13
3	75	80	5
4	38	100	62
5	89	91	2
6	86	100	14
7	44	91	47
8	64	91	27
9	70	100	30
10	63	100	37
11	44	90	46
12	56	100	44
Average Score	62	94	32

between the pre and post observations was compared for those who were coached with those who were not, the results indicated that the instructors who participated in coaching increased in their abilities to perform the steps correctly to a greater extent than did their colleagues not involved in coaching. The average percent of growth for those coached was 35 percent, while the average percent of growth for those not involved in coaching was 23 percent. Thus, those who were coached increased slightly more than the group as a whole. The findings regarding the effects of coaching on instructors' abilities to develop their skills is suggestive, and not definitive, given the small size of the sample analyzed. However, these results do imply that coaching, or some form of skill reinforcement and systematic feedback, has helped instructors in developing their instructional skills.

In summary, the results of the analysis of the ESL Techniques Feedback Forms has indicated that Institute participants who were observed instructing classes--both prior to and after participating in the Institute--increased overall in their abilities to perform specific ESL Techniques correctly. Furthermore, preliminary results from a subsample of the instructors revealed that the coaching process has facilitated these instructors' capabilities to develop their ESL instructional skills.

Use of CBAE Classroom Management Methods. During 1986-87, the ESL Institute sessions emphasized the importance of using ESL instructional techniques in the context of an organized CBAE

lesson. Several aspects of lesson and classroom management were covered in the training sessions, including instructors' use of: a) a lesson plan; b) a competency objective to direct the lesson; c) organized learning activities, such as appropriate transitions and pacing in the lesson; and d) classroom grouping categories.

In order to measure instructors' improvement in managing a lesson over the duration of the Institute, data from two categories on the Classroom Observation Form were analyzed. The percent of pilot study instructors, who used a lesson plan and taught to a competency objective in classes in the pre-Institute observations, was compared with the percent of instructors performing the same activities during the post observations. Table 3 presents these results. As is shown in the table, the percent of instructors performing these two activities increased from the pre to the post observations. However, the increase in the percent of instructors who taught to a competency objective was more substantial than the increase in the percent of instructors who used a lesson plan. The results also show that instructors were more likely to use a lesson plan than to teach a competency objective during the pre observations, which suggests that more emphasis might be given in the Institute to training instructors on the use of competency objectives as one strategy for focusing a lesson.

In addition to lesson management, two aspects of instructors' classroom management strategies were examined in the evaluation. The scores from two categories on the T.I.P.

TABLE 3

Comparison of Observations of Instructors
Lesson Management Activities Before and After
Their Participation in the ESL Institute

Activity	Pre Institute Percentage of Instructors Performing Activity	Post Institute Percentage of Instructors Performing Activity
Used Lesson Plan	60 (N = 15)	73 (N = 15)
Taught to Competency Objective	42 (N = 19)	84 (N = 19)

Summary Form--organization of learning activities and use of classroom grouping strategies--were analyzed for the pre and post observations. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4. As indicated in the table, instructors' scores on these two items increased over the duration of the Institute. Even though the average score for instructors' use of grouping strategies was slightly higher for the pre observations, the amount of change for the two items was the same.

The Coaching Process. At the conclusion of the post-observation session, observers interviewed instructors about their experiences with the coaching process. Post-observation interviews were completed with 16 of the 20 instructors who participated in the pre and post observation. Twelve of these instructors had functioned as coaches, while four were unable to undertake the Institute's coaching component.

The twelve individuals who had participated as coaches varied in the extent of their experience as ESL instructors--from less than one year to almost two years' experience. Regardless of the amount of their teaching experience, all instructors who were interviewed reported that the coaching had been useful. They found the process to be non-threatening and credible, especially since the feedback and reinforcement that instructors gave to each other was based on the specific, detailed information provided on the ESL Techniques Feedback Form. Although a time-consuming process, instructors felt that

TABLE 4

Comparison of Observations of Instructors
Use of CBAE Classroom Management Strategies
Before and After Participation in the ESL Institute

Strategy	Pre Institute Average Score (N=20)	Post Institute Average Score (N=20)	Difference
Organized Learning Activities	1.55	2.275	.725
Uses Classroom Grouping Techniques	1.6	2.325	.725

the opportunity to observe others and to receive feedback related to their own performance made it worthwhile. Most of those interviewed would be willing to repeat the process, and a few are continuing to coach on a regular basis.

Although instructors viewed coaching as beneficial, there was some variance in their experience with the process. Instructors who had some prior knowledge of the ESL Techniques, and who were paired with a coach of similar background, tended to report that coaching helped them to refine and develop their skills as ESL instructors. Furthermore, they also found the process of giving specific feedback to their colleague easier and more natural. Less experienced instructors sometimes found it difficult both to learn new skills--i.e., the ESL Techniques--as well as to coach. While they found the process of being coached very helpful, these instructors found themselves less adept at coaching. This last finding is not surprising, given that these instructors would tend to have a less-developed knowledge base to draw upon in giving feedback.

The instructors who did not coach reported that several factors had influenced this decision. The most critical of these were: incompatible work schedules with their coaching team member; lack of administrative support--e.g., release time--for undertaking the process; and non-compatibility of the coaching teams.

Based on the instructors' experiences, administrative support is a critical factor for the success of the implementation of a coaching component. During the pilot study, administrators supported their instructors in the Institute and coaching processes in a number of ways, such as: a) attending the Institute sessions; b) providing paid or release time for instructors to coach or be coached; c) scheduling follow-up and feedback sessions; d) designating a key staff person to facilitate instructor participation in the Institute sessions and the coaching process; e) facilitating, but not mandating, the pairing of coaches; and f) providing the resources--textbooks, audio-visual support materials, and copier machines--necessary for instructors to develop lessons based on the ESL Institute training concepts. The undertaking of one or more of these activities greatly contributed to the success of the Institute and, in particular, the coaching component. One agency's efforts to provide support for coaching are illustrated in Vignette No. 1.

Summary. The analyses of data collected during the evaluation's pilot study have shown that the Institute has been successful in meeting its objectives of increasing instructors' abilities to: use specific ESL Techniques; use the sequential steps in these Techniques; and use CBAE classroom management strategies. The Institute participants who implemented the coaching process during the past year found the experience to be both beneficial to them as instructors, and a way of building

Vignette No. 1

AGENCY SUPPORT

A number of local agencies initiated focused efforts to support instructors and assess the effects of instructor participation in the Institute and coaching process. In one agency, 20 instructors (ten peer coaching teams) participated in an evaluation study. Each instructor received a $100 stipend to participate in the project.

Each participant visited his/her peer coach at least twice and was coached at least twice. The techniques most often observed were: focused listening, drills, dialogues, pair practice, and language generating. Participants often observed several techniques demonstrated during one visit.

A summary of the Evaluation Form from the study indicated that participants:

* Unanimously found coaching to be a positive experience. The most positive aspects mentioned in follow-up interviews were: 1) learning took place in a non-threatening setting; 2) the opportunity was built-in to improve one's techniques; 3) having specific criteria for each technique provided a structured format for observations; and 4) coaching was a learning process.

* Found the Feedback Forms to be very useful. The Forms provided standard criteria for good instruction and proved to be even more valuable while being observed (lesson planning) than observing.

* Felt strongly that one must see the techniques demonstrated/modeled in an arena such as the Institute before being able to use the Feedback Forms.

* Felt that the Institute should be conducted yearly, perhaps focusing on the use of only one or two techniques each year.

collegial relationships within their own agencies. Of particular importance has been the support provided by agency administrators to instructors who participated in the Institute. As one administrator commented during her interview with an observer: "I am amazed at the amount of improvement in my two instructors who had no previous training."

Participants' and Trainers' Perceptions of the Institute

Both Institute participants and trainers were asked to complete evaluation forms after attending the Institute training sessions and the in-service Institute Colloquia conducted during 1986-87. The summary results from the analyses of these forms are presented below.

Participants' Perceptions. Overall, instructors who participated in the seven ESL Institutes conducted during the past year found the sessions to be well designed and well paced. They felt that the trainers were adept in conveying the underlying concepts of the Institutes, and used the training and audio-visual support materials effectively.

While the instructors found that the Institute modules concerning the conduct of an ESL lesson, development of listening and speaking skills, and coaching had been taught well, they did comment that often the training schedule was a bit ambitious given the amount of time available. The general feeling among instructors was that the number of ESL Techniques covered in depth during the Institute sessions should be reduced. The

instructors found the modeling of Techniques and the opportunities to practice and receive feedback about their use of the Techniques the most beneficial aspects of the Institute sessions.

Trainer Perceptions. Institute trainers also were asked to complete evaluation forms at the conclusion of the colloquia sessions in May and August. Overall, the trainers reported that these in-service sessions were invaluable. The topics that trainers thought most helpful were: a) the modeling of ESL Techniques; b) the demonstration of feedback sessions; and c) opportunities to practice training.

In spite of the skills that trainers bring with them to the Institute, they feel that their on-going reinforcement and skill enhancement are critical if the ESL Institute is to present a consistent, standardized program. As one trainer commented after the August Colloquium, "I really feel more confident and so much more prepared to do the training."

Trainers do feel that their continuous efforts in clarifying and refining the Institute materials have resulted in an improved program. During the August Colloquium, two small groups working concurrently with the same Feedback Form, analyzing the same ESL Technique, raised the same questions and reached the same conclusions. In the words of one trainer, "We see convergence of the level of trainers' skills."

V. SUMMARY AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The evaluation of the ESL Institute undertaken during 1986-87 has provided a rich array of information concerning both the Institute's effectiveness in achieving its objectives, and the Institute components that require further refinement during 1987-88. Viewed as a formative evaluation, the results of the pilot study of Institute participants have shown that ESL instructors' skills will improve when a systematic, reinforced intervention--i.e., ESL Institute--is implemented. Critical to the success of the Institute are factors such as the quality and consistency of the training; the selection of participants and customization of training program to their needs; the administrative support that is provided to Institute participants; and the perceived value of the program by both participants and trainers.

This section of the report discusses the Institute refinement activities that will be undertaken during 1987-88, based on the findings from the past year's evaluation. These activities will focus on three areas: 1) the Institute's design and content, 2) the transfer process that will be used to prepare agencies for participation in the Institute, and 3) the types of reinforcement activities that will be available to Institute participants, to assist in the skill-building and skill-retention processes. Each of these areas is described in this section.

Institute Design and Content

Based on the findings of the past year's evaluation, refinement of the Institute design will focus on four aspects: 1) relationship of techniques to lesson, 2) feedback forms, 3) use of videos, and 4) Institute content.

Relationship of Techniques to Lessons. Training in each technique has focused on the steps in using the technique. It has been preceded by training on the stages of a CBE/ESL lesson. The 1987-88 Institute will reinforce the relationship between the technique and the lesson. The demonstration of each technique will be analyzed in two ways: first, the relationship of the technique to the total lesson; and second, the steps in the technique.

Feedback Forms. The Feedback Forms identify the steps within a technique and suggest options for each step. Through feedback obtained from trainers in the colloquia and through review by the evaluators, some discrepancies have been noted in the internal consistency of the forms. In order to rectify these inconsistencies, refinement will be undertaken in two areas: within forms and across forms. There will be a review of steps within each form to ensure that each step is essential to the technique; any step that relates to general lesson planning, rather than specific technique, will be eliminated. There will be a review across the forms to ensure that each of the following aspects of competency-based adult education is

addressed in a consistent manner on each of the forms: 1) grouping strategies, 2) use of material, 3) learning styles, and 4) monitoring of students.

Use of Videos. Videotapes currently exist for the demonstration of six of the techniques taught in the Institute. The use of videotapes provides a standardized model for the Institute participants to learn the technique. Participants across Institutes see the same demonstrations and the same options for executing each teaching step of the technique. The videotapes also enable trainers to prepare themselves through independent study. Therefore, in order to assure consistency in delivery to participants and to provide for on-going training of trainers, all demonstrations of techniques will be portrayed on video.

Institute Content. During 1986-87, trainers had the option of covering 11 techniques across the three Institute sessions. There was not sufficient time in the three sessions to review each of the techniques, along with the other information that needed to be covered. In order to ensure there is adequate time to teach the materials in each session, the special modules to be highlighted will be determined prior to Session I.

Organizational Conditions for Implementation.

The results of the study have indicated that there are two organizational conditions which are critical to implementation of the Institute: 1) the matching of participants' skill needs with the training offered by the Institute, and 2) the provision of support to participants from their local agency administration.

Matching Needs with Training. To ensure that Institute participants' needs match the training offered by the Institute, an assessment by Institute staff will occur prior to the first session of each Institute. This arrangement will result in the selection of modules for training. Selection will be based on the training and experience of those instructors who will be participating in the Institute, as well as on the language proficiency level and needs of the participants' students. The assessment also will result in the identification of a change agent within the agency of the Institute participant.

Administrative Support. Findings from the pilot study related to administrative support identified a variety of ways that management can offer support to Institute participants. These included: a) attending the Institute themselves, b) providing paid time for participants to attend the Institute, c) providing participants with pay or substitutes for the time they observe and coach, d) scheduling follow-up or feedback sessions, and e) providing the resources necessary for instructors to develop lessons based on the training concepts.

In order to ensure that Institute participants receive support from their local agency, Institute staff will meet with agency administrators to discuss the support activities identified in the study. Prior to an agency's staff participation in Institute training, an explicit agreement will be made between the agency's management and Institute staff that identifies the support the agency will provide to their instructors who participate in Institute training.

Skill Reinforcement

During 1986-87, the ESL Institute incorporated a process for reinforcing participants as they acquired new instructional skills. This process--coaching--was based on a model that has been used in private industry for training mid-level managers to work with their sales forces. As well, the process has been adopted by training programs for elementary and secondary teachers.

The Institute participants who performed the coaching found the process helpful as they began to implement what they had learned during the Institute sessions. As well, the coaching gave participants an opportunity to establish collegial relationships with other ESL instructors, and to share their teaching experiences with these individuals through the coaching sessions. Institute participants who were more experienced ESL instructors, and who were matched with a colleague of similar expertise and background, found the coaching to be the most beneficial.

In the cases where participants either did not find the coaching process satisfactory or possible, two factors seemed to be critical. In the first case, participants reported that it was difficult both to learn new skills--i.e., the ESL Techniques--as well as to learn how to coach. When two less-experienced instructors were paired as coaches, then the task appeared to be especially difficult. In the second case, a number of participants reported that without administrative support--e.g., release time--the coaching sessions were impossible to schedule. The findings from all of these experiences suggest that options for reinforcement should be established for the Institute during 1987-88, which can address the needs of a variety of ESL instructors in a range of organizational environments. These options are presented below.

Expert Coaching Model. As has been the experience in the coaching programs utilized in private industry, often coaching is most effective when a more experienced--i.e., skilled--individual is paired with a colleague who is less skilled. Thus, during the coming year, the Institute will offer a coaching option in which more experienced instructors who participate in the Institute will become the coaches for new ESL instructors. This model--a one-way coaching process--should help both to build the instructional skills of the new instructor, and to reinforce the skills of the more experienced instructor. This model also adheres to an important principle in training--that only one new skill can be learned at a time.

Peer Coaching Model. As was the experience with a number of the Institute participants this year, coaching is particularly effective when undertaken by coaching pairs who have some experience in using the ESL Techniques being taught in the Institute. In this option--a reciprocal coaching model--experienced instructors who participate in the Institute will have an opportunity to learn the coaching process and to function as peer coaches.

Change Agent Model. The final option for reinforcement in the Institute during 1987-88 will be the change agent model--whereby an individual in each participating adult education agency will be designated as the "change agent" for supporting the Institute's activities. Given the finding that reinforcement is critical to skill building, and that coaching may not be a viable option for all Institute participants, this model offers another opportunity for providing reinforcement. The "change agent" will participate in the Institute training, if possible, and will be responsible for bringing Institute participants from his/her agency together between Institute sessions to discuss the skills that are being taught. Thus, this model provides for some sharing of participants' experiences while they are learning and practicing new skills. These meetings also will serve as opportunities for Institute participants to develop or reinforce existing collegial relationships with other instructors in their agency.

Summary. The three models for skill reinforcement described above are intended to provide ESL Institute participants with viable options for developing the skills presented during the Institute sessions. These models take into consideration the variety of instructors who will be attending the Institute and the different organizational conditions in which they work.

APPENDIX A

ESL Techniques Feedback Forms

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: FOCUSED LISTENING

			Observed Behavior YES	NO
1.		Did the instructor set up the situation?		
	HL	by describing or explaining	☐	
	or			
LL	HL	by providing a visual for students to discuss	☐	
or	or			
LL	HL	by asking questions for students to	☐	
or	or	answer		
LL	HL	by relating it to previously studied curriculum	☐	
	or			
	HL	by eliciting ideas or experiences from the students	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2.		Did the instructor prepare the students to understand the language they would hear?	YES	NO
LL	HL	vocabulary	☐	
LL	HL	structures (past tense, comparative adjectives)	☐	
	HL	functions (clarify, describe)	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.		Did the instructor provide tasks that required students to demonstrate comprehension?	YES	NO
LL		by responding physically	☐	
or				
LL	HL	by completing a worksheet (e.g., circle the correct choice, fill in the blank, label the diagrams or visuals)	☐	
	or			
	HL	by answering questions	☐	
		other _____	☐	

REV: 01/08/87

© ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

FEEDBACK FORM: FOCUSED LISTENING--continued

			Observed Behavior	
4.	Did the instructor provide examples for the task?		YES	NO
	LL or LL or LL	HL or HL or HL	by showing a completed item or two	☐
			by completing the first item or two	☐
			by guiding students in completing the first item or two	☐
			other _____	☐
5.	Did the instructor provide materials to guide students in the listening task?		YES	NO
	LL or LL or LL	HL or HL	realia	☐
			visuals	☐
			visuals and print	☐
			print only	☐
			other _____	☐
6.	Was the language presented with normal speed, intonation, stress and volume?		YES	NO

(percentage of language that was natural speech)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

REV: 01/08/87

CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

FEEDBACK FORM: FOCUSED LISTENING--continued

Observed Behavior

7. Did the students participate in the activity? YES NO

(percentage of students that participated)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

8. Did the instructor provide feedback to students on the accuracy of their listening? YES NO

LL		by providing the correct answer	☐
or			
LL	HL	by eliciting answers from individual students	☐
or	or		
LL	HL	by eliciting answers from all students in order to identify items not agreed on	☐
or	or		
LL	HL	by having students listen again in order to correct their mistakes	☐
		other _____	☐

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ___
presentation ___
practice ___
application ___

Follow up activity agreed upon:
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

REV: 01/08/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
PUBLICATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: EARLY PRODUCTION

		Observed Behavior	
1.	Did the instructor set up the situation?	YES	NO
	LL by stating the objective	☐	
	or LL by using visuals and/or realia	☐	
	or LL by asking questions	☐	
	other _____	☐	
2.	Did the instructor provide a context for new vocabulary?	YES	NO
	LL by using the word in context	☐	
	or LL by using realia/visuals	☐	
	other _____	☐	
3.	Did the instructor provide comprehensible input?	YES	NO
	LL by using pictures/visuals	☐	
	or LL by using realia	☐	
	or LL by using gestures/body movement	☐	
	other _____	☐	

REV: 01/07/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

FEEDBACK FORM: EARLY PRODUCTION-continued

Observed Behavior

4. Did the instructor ask questions that required only one word or short phrase response?

		YES	NO
LL or LL or LL	by asking yes/no questions	☐	
	by asking either/or questions	☐	
	by making open-ended statements	☐	
	other _____	☐	

5. Did the instructor repeat back correctly language the students pronounced incorrectly? YES NO

(percentage of time incorrect language repeated back correctly)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ____
presentation ____
practice ____
application ____

Follow up activity agreed upon:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

REV: 01/08/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: DRILLS

			Observed Behavior	
1.	Did the instructor provide meaning for the utterance being practiced?		YES	NO
	LL HL	by providing context	☐	
	or			
	LL	by using realia	☐	
	or			
	LL	by using visuals	☐	
	or			
	LL	by using drawings	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2.	Did the instructor focus the drill?		YES	NO
	LL HL	repetition (for pronunciation)	☐	
	or or			
	LL HL	substitution (for vocabulary)	☐	
	or or			
	LL HL	transformation (for structure)	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.	Did the instructor use natural speed, volume, intonation and stress?		YES	NO
	(percentage of time natural speech was modeled)			
	0-35%	35-70% 70-95% 100%		
	1	2 3 4		
4.	Did the instructor model expected responses before asking the students to respond?		YES	NO
	(number of times modeled)			
	one	two three or more		
	1	2 3		
5.	Did the instructor direct students?		YES	NO
	LL HL	by using hand signals	☐	
	or or			
	LL HL	by giving verbal commands ("repeat")	☐	
		other _____	☐	

REV: 01/08/87

...OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS.
...ON FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1985

Observed Behavior

6. Did the instructor repeat the utterance after the student repetition to provide positive reinforcement? YES NO

(percentage of time utterance repeated)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

7. Did the instructor move from whole group to individual practice? YES NO

LL	HL	whole group	☐
LL	HL	half class--half class	☐
LL	HL	small groups (e.g., rows, men/women)	☐
LL	HL	individuals	☐
		other _____	☐

8. Did the students demonstrate control of the language practiced? YES NO

(percentage of students who demonstrated control)

0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
1	2	3	4

9. Did the instructor give students the opportunity to apply the language to their own lives? YES NO

LL or	HL or	by responding to the instructor with information about themselves	☐
LL	HL or	by responding to classmates with information about themselves	☐
	HL	by initiating	☐
		other _____	☐

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Follow up activity agreed upon:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ___
presentation ___
practice ___
application ___

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1985

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: DIALOGUES

			Observed Behavior YES	NO
1.		Did the instructor set up the situation?		
	HL or	by describing	☐	
LL or	HL or	by using visuals or realia	☐	
LL	HL or	by asking questions to elicit information from students (e.g., about a picture, about their own lives)	☐	
	HL	by presenting a problem for students to solve	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2.		Did the instructor provide a model dialogue?	YES	NO
LL	HL or	by modeling one or playing a tape	☐	
	HL	by eliciting one from students	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.		Did the instructor model the complete dialogue before students were expected to speak or respond physically?	YES	NO

(number of times modeled)

one 1 | two 2 | three or more 3

			YES	NO
4.		Did the instructor use some method to indicate the two speakers?		
LL or		two hands or puppets	☐	
LL or	HL or	stick figures or drawings and pointing	☐	
LL	HL	changing positions	☐	
		other _____	☐	

REV: 1/08/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

				Observed Behavior	
5.	Did the instructor ask questions about the dialogue to check student comprehension before expecting student production?			YES	NO
	LL or		yes/no questions	☐	
	LL	HL	"wh" questions	☐	
			other _____	☐	
6.	Did the instructor model and provide for practice of the parts of the dialogue with the whole group?			YES	NO
	LL or	HL or	repetition (e.g., line-by-line, backword build-up)	☐	
	LL or	HL or	drills for vocabulary	☐	
	LL or	HL or	drills for structure practice	☐	
	LL	HL	two-line exchanges	☐	
			other _____	☐	
7.	Did the instructor model and cue practice of the the whole dialogue with the whole group?			YES	NO
	LL or		by showing visuals, using gestures	☐	
	LL or	HL or	by providing key words or phrases	☐	
	LL	HL or	by using a disappearing dialogue	☐	
		HL or	by providing a complete written dialogue	☐	
		HL	by eliciting from students the cues for each line of a dialogue	☐	
			other _____	☐	

REV: 01/08/87

© [illegible] OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
[illegible] OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

FEEDBACK FORM: DIALOGUES--continued

Observed Behavior

8. Did the instructor move from whole group to small group practice? YES NO

LL	HL	whole group	☐
LL	HL	half class --- half class	☐
LL	HL	small groups (e.g. men/women; rows)	☐
		other _____	☐

9. Did the instructor provide for simultaneous individual practice? YES NO

(percentage of students who practiced)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

10. Did the instructor provide materials to guide students in the individual practice? YES NO

LL		realia	☐
or			
LL		visuals	☐
or			
LL	HL	visuals and print	☐
	or		
	HL	print only	☐
		other _____	☐

11. Did the instructor assess individual progress? YES NO

LL	HL	by listening to individuals during simultaneous practice	☐
LL	HL	by having individuals model for whole class	☐
		other _____	☐

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ____
presentation ____
practice ____
application ____

Follow up activity agreed upon:
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

REV: 01/08/87

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: PAIR PRACTICE

			Observed Behavior YES	NO
1.	Did the instructor prepare the class for the task to be practiced by students in pairs?			
LL or		by demonstrating both parts	☐	
LL	HL	by demonstrating with an instructional aide or a student	☐	
	or HL	by describing or explaining the task	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2.	Did the instructor provide group practice so that students were able to produce the language in pairs without the teacher model?			
LL ↓	HL	teacher model/students repeat	☐	
	↓ HL	teacher --- students	☐	
LL		half class --- half class	☐	
↓ LL		odd rows --- even rows	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.	Did the instructor provide materials to guide students in the pair activity?			
LL or		realia	☐	
LL or		visuals	☐	
LL	HL	visuals and print	☐	
	or HL	print only	☐	
		other _____	☐	

REV: 01/09/87

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

Observed Behavior

4. Did the instructor provide materials which focused the activity on each of the following? YES NO

LL	HL	on language (structures, vocabulary	☐
LL	HL	on theme or topic (health, transportation)	☐
LL	HL	on communication	☐
		other _____	☐

5. Did the instructor direct student movement into pairs? YES NO

LL or	HL or	by using hand cues to indicate pairs	☐
LL or	HL	by moving students' desks together	☐
LL		by using a matching activity (e.g. numbers index cards with question/answer, color/names of color, pictures cut in half)	☐
	or HL	by describing or explaining	☐
		other _____	☐

6. Did the instructor move around the room to listen and provide assistance to individual pairs? YES NO

(percentage of time instructor assisted pairs)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

7. Did the instructor work with pairs who appeared to have difficulty performing the task? YES NO

(percentage of those having difficulty that instructor worked with)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

REV: 1/08/86

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

86

FEEDBACK FORM: PAIR PRACTICE--continued

Observed Behavior

8. Did the students participate in the activity? YES NO

(percentage of students participating)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

9. Did the students complete the activity? YES NO

(percentage of students completing the activity)

0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
1	2	3	4

10. Did the instructor provide a culminating activity for the whole group? YES NO

LL HL by providing practice on general problem areas ☐

or or

LL HL by providing opportunities for individuals to demonstrate for the whole class ☐

or or

LL HL by providing opportunities for students to apply the language to their own lives ☐

other _____ ☐

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ___
presentation ___
practice ___
application ___

Follow up activity agreed upon:

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

_____

REV: 01/09/87

© ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: INFORMATION GAP

			Observed Behavior	
1.		Did the instructor relate the situation to the the students' own lives?	YES	NO
	LL HL	by describing the situation	☐	
	or or			
	LL HL	by asking questions	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2		Did the instructor precede the activity with practice in language needed to participate in it?	YES	NO
	LL HL	vocabulary	☐	
	LL HL	structures (e.g., past tense)	☐	
	HL	functions (e.g., clarify, describe)	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.		Did the instructor model the activity in front of the whole class?	YES	NO
	LL HL	by demonstrating both parts	☐	
	or or			
	LL HL	by demonstrating with an instructional aide or student	☐	
	or or			
	LL HL	by having two students demonstrate	☐	
		other _____	☐	
4.		Did the instructor direct student movement into the activity?	YES	NO
	LL HL	by assigning students to work together	☐	
	or or			
	LL HL	by encouraging students to form their own teams	☐	
		other _____	☐	

REV: 01/09/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

FEEDBACK FORM: INFORMATION GAP--continued

Observed Behavior

5. Did the instructor provide materials to guide students in the activity? YES NO

LL realia or visuals ☐
or
LL HL visuals and print ☐
or
HL print only ☐

other _____ ☐

6. Did the instructor move around the room to listen and assist teams? YES NO

(percentage of time instructor assisted teams

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

7. Did the instructor work with teams that appeared to have difficulty performing the task? YES NO

(percentage of those having difficulty that instructor worked with)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

8. Did the students participate in the activity? YES NO

(percentage of students participating)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

9. Did the students complete the activity? YES NO

(percentage of students completing the activity)

0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
1	2	3	4

REV: 01/09/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

Observed Behavior

10. Did the instructor provide feedback to students on the accuracy of their answers? YES NO

LL or LL	HL or HL	by providing the correct answers	☐
		by eliciting the correct answers from individual students	☐
		by eliciting answers from all students in order to identify items not agreed on	☐
		other _____	☐

11. Did the instructor correct errors only when there was a communication breakdown? YES NO

(percentage of errors corrected that were for communication breakdown)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ___
presentation ___
practice ___
application ___

Follow up activity agreed upon:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

REV: 01/09/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1985

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: ROLE PLAY

			Observed Behavior	
1.		Did the instructor relate the situation to the students' experiences?	YES	NO
	LL or LL	HL or HL by describing the situation	☐	
		by asking questions	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2.		Did the instructor provide practice on language needed to participate in the task?	YES	NO
	LL	HL vocabulary	☐	
	LL	HL structures (e.g., past tense, comparative adjectives)	☐	
		HL functions (e.g., to clarify, to describe)	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.		Did the students demonstrate control of the language needed for the task?	YES	NO
		(percentage of language students controlled) 0-25% (1) 25-50% (2) 50-75% (3) 75-100% (4)		
4.		Were roles assigned?	YES	NO
	LL or LL	HL or HL by the teacher	☐	
	LL or LL	HL or HL by students volunteering	☐	
	LL or LL	HL or HL by other students selecting	☐	
		other _____	☐	
5.		Did the students assume the assigned roles?	YES	NO
		(percentage of students that assumed roles) 0-35% (1) 35-70% (2) 70-95% (3) 100% (4)		

FEEDBACK FORM: ROLE PLAY--continued

Observed Behavior

6. Did the instructor provide materials to assist students in the role play? YES NO

LL		props (visuals, realia)	☐
or			
LL	HL	props and print	☐
	or		
	HL	print only	☐
	other	_____	☐

7. Did the students participate in the activity? YES NO

(percentage of students that participated)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

8. Did the instructor correct errors only when there was a communication breakdown? YES NO

(percentage of errors corrected that were for communication breakdown)

0-35%	35-70%	70-95%	100%
1	2	3	4

9. Did the instructor provide feedback on problem areas identified during the role play? YES NO

LL	HL	by pointing out the problem	☐
or	or		
LL	HL	by providing a solution to the problem	☐
or	or		
LL	HL	by getting student(s) to provide a solution	☐
or	or		
LL	HL	by providing opportunities for further practice	☐
		other _____	☐

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ___
presentation ___
practice ___
application ___

Follow up activity agreed upon:
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

REV: 01/08/87

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION © 1985

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: LANGUAGE GENERATING

			Observed Behavior	
1.	Did the instructor set up the topic/situation?		YES	NO
	LL HL or or	by telling a story	☐	
	LL HL or or	by using a visual	☐	
	LL HL	by using realia	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2.	Did the instructor check for student comprehension?		YES	NO
	LL HL or or	by asking yes/no questions	☐	
	LL HL	by asking "wh" questions	☐	
	or HL	by eliciting examples	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.	Did the instructor ask questions that enabled students to share their own experience with that situation or topic?		YES	NO
	LL HL	factual questions	☐	
	HL	evaluation or judgement questions	☐	
		other _____	☐	
4.	Did the students relate to the situation?		YES	NO
	(percentage of students who related) 0-25% 1 / 25-50% 2 / 50-75% 3 / 75-100% 4			
5.	Did the instructor elicit language that would be used in the situation?		YES	NO
	LL HL	vocabulary	☐	
	LL HL	structures (e.g., past tense, comparative adjectives)	☐	
	HL	functions (e.g., clarify, describe)	☐	
		other _____	☐	

REV: 01/09/87

© ASSOCIATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS FOUNDATION

Observed Behavior

6. Did the instructor select from the language elicited a focus for student instruction?

			YES	NO
LL	HL	vocabulary	☐	
LL	HL	structures	☐	
	HL	functions	☐	
		other _____	☐	

7. Did the instructor have students practice the language?

			YES	NO
LL or	HL or	by responding to questions	☐	
LL	HL	by asking and responding to questions	☐	
	or HL	by generating a dialogue	☐	
		other _____	☐	

8. Did the instructor provide materials to assist in the language practice?

			YES	NO
	HL	key word or phrases	☐	
LL		written dialogue	☐	
		other _____	☐	

	YES	NO
Lesson Plan		
Review		
Attached		

Stage of Lesson: Check stage(s) observed.
warm up ____
presentation ____
practice ____
application ____

Follow up activity agreed upon:
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

REV: 01/09/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

Instructor _____ District _____

Coach _____ Site _____

Date and Length of Observation _____ Level of Class _____

FEEDBACK FORM: LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE

			Observed Behavior	
1.	Did the instructor provide a common experience for the whole group?		YES	NO
	LL or HL	field trip	☐	
	LL or HL	class visitor	☐	
	LL or HL	class project, activity, or demonstration (e.g. making popcorn)	☐	
	LL or	discussion of series of pictures, a live action sequence, etc.	☐	
	HL	discussion of news (e.g. earthquake, bad weather)	☐	
		other _____	☐	
2.	Did the instructor elicit the story from the students to get common language?		YES	NO
	LL or HL	by asking specific questions	☐	
	LL or HL	by having students ask each other questions	☐	
	LL or HL	by having students respond to general questions (e.g. What happened? What happened next?)	☐	
		other _____	☐	
3.	Did the instructor have students dictate the story?		YES	NO

(percentage of students who dictated the story)

0-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%
1	2	3	4

REV: 01/09/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985

Observed Behavior

4. Did the instructor follow writing conventions? YES NO

LL	HL	left to right	☐
LL	HL	top to bottom	☐
LL	HL	indenting	☐
LL	HL	appropriate punctuation	☐

5. Did the instructor read the story aloud, giving the students a chance to edit their work? YES NO

(number of times instructor read story)

one (1) two (2) three or more (3)

6. Did the instructor provide practice in reading the story on the board? YES NO

LL		by pointing and modeling prior to students reading	☐
LL		by pointing and repeating with students	☐
LL	HL	by pointing without modeling and having students read	☐
		other _____ _____	☐

REV: 01/08/87

© ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION 1985